



# Selecting Optimal Background Knowledge Sources for the Ontology Matching Task

Abdel Nasser Tigrine, Zohra Bellahsene, Konstantin Todorov

► **To cite this version:**

Abdel Nasser Tigrine, Zohra Bellahsene, Konstantin Todorov. Selecting Optimal Background Knowledge Sources for the Ontology Matching Task. 2016. <lirmm-01315625>

**HAL Id: lirmm-01315625**

**<https://hal-lirmm.ccsd.cnrs.fr/lirmm-01315625>**

Submitted on 13 May 2016

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Selecting Optimal Background Knowledge Sources for the Ontology Matching Task

Abdel Nasser Tigrine, Zohra Bellahsene, Konstantin Todorov

{lastname}@lirmm.fr

LIRMM / University of Montpellier, France

**Abstract.** It is a common practice to rely on background knowledge (BK) in order to assist and improve the ontology matching process. The choice of an appropriate source of background knowledge for a given matching task, however, remains a vastly unexplored question. In the current paper, we propose an automatic BK selection approach that does not depend on an initial direct matching, can handle multilingualism and is domain independent. The approach is based on the construction of an index for a set of BK candidates. The couple of ontologies to be aligned is modeled as a query with respect to the indexed BK sources and the best candidate is selected by following an information retrieval paradigm. We evaluate our system in a series of experiments in both general-purpose and domain-specific matching scenarios. The results show that our approach is capable of selecting the BK that provides the best alignment quality with respect to a given reference alignment for each of the considered matching tasks.

## 1 Introduction

Over the past years, the web has been continuously evolving from a web of documents to a web of data, following the principles of data and knowledge representation, publishing and linking. The Linked Open Data project<sup>1</sup>, the web of data most successful initiative to date, comprises nowadays hundreds of datasets over several domains of life and science. While information is expressed by the help of RDF (Resource Description Framework) statements, knowledge about the domains of interest is given in the form of ontologies, which provide common vocabularies to name classes of things (concepts) and relations between these classes, defining in an explicit manner their semantics. Ontologies, expressed in RDFS or OWL, can be simple sets of terms, thesauri or more complex structured vocabularies with logical expressions that allow for the inference of new facts.

It occurs often that ontologies, describing similar or equivalent domains of knowledge, are expressed differently. These differences, referred to as ontology heterogeneities, can occur in terms of terminology (choosing different names to refer to the same concepts and relations), structure or semantics (relating classes in different ways, giving different intensions to information) or simply in terms of

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://linkeddata.org>

syntax (choosing different formal representations). In order to unlock the potential of the web of data and foster the creation of a veritable information network, heterogeneous ontologies have to be linked together by explicitly declaring the equivalence relations between their entities (classes and properties). The field of ontology matching has taken the challenge of proposing solutions that allow to automatically discover the correspondence between ontological elements in the presence of one or more of the heterogeneities cited above. As a result of almost 20 years of research and practice, many approaches and systems exist, capable of aligning highly heterogeneous ontologies [1].

It has been shown in recent publications [2,3] that the ontology matching process can benefit largely from the use of Background Knowledge (*BK*). *BK* is understood as any external reference knowledge that can facilitate the matching process, given in the form of large general purpose ontologies or well-established knowledge graphs (such as DBPedia or YAGO), domain specific ontologies, or the web at large. We outline three main advantages of the use of *BK* when aligning ontologies. In the first place, as observed by [4], there is always an inherent semantic gap between two ontologies, coming from the missing semantic context of their acquisition. *BK* can help close that gap, as shown in [5]. In the second place, and even more importantly, the ontology matching process is heavy and costly: most of the existing matching tools are complex engineering artefacts comprising a sophisticatedly orchestrated pipeline of matching modules, mapping filtering and semantic verification components. In a recent study [3], we have shown that an appropriately chosen *BK* source can help significantly lighten the overall matching process. Finally, in specific domains there is a clear need for specific reference knowledge, since the commonly used external knowledge sources, such as WordNet, fail to provide the semantic information that is needed to discover correctly the correspondences between domain specific concepts.

While there is little doubt about the benefits of using *BK* for ontology matching, outlined as one of the challenges for the field by [1], an important question remains largely unanswered: how to select an optimal *BK* source for a given ontology matching task out of a set of known *BK* sources? We understand “optimal” as the source that provides the best quality of the alignment produced for two ontologies. In this paper, we attempt to answer this question by proposing an approach for the automatic selection of a *BK* source for a given ontology matching task. We situate the problem in an information retrieval framework. The set of known *BK*s is indexed by using the well-known vector space model while the two ontologies to be aligned are represented as a query document. The comparison between the ontologies and the *BK*s is based on their content, but also on their structure. We elaborate on the different choices of a similarity measure for this task. Particularly, we show that the commonly used cosine similarity is not the best choice in this scenario and we propose the use of correlation-based similarity measures. The selection system that implements this approach has the properties of being *fully automatic*, *domain independent* and *multilingual*, as well as being entirely *dissociated from the alignment process*.

In order to evaluate the proposed approach, we carry out experiments on benchmark data coming from the ontology alignment evaluation initiative (OAEI), as well as on real world data in the musical field. We used as background knowledge sources a mixed set of domain specific and general purpose knowledge graphs. The results show that our approach guarantees the selection of the optimal *BK* source with respect to each of the matching tasks that has been performed in terms of the quality of the produced alignment by using the selected *BK*.

The paper is structured as follows. The following section introduces the BK selection problem by focusing on requirements and criteria for selection. Section 3 describes our approach that we support experimentally in Section 4. Several related results are discussed and compared to our method in Section 5 before we conclude in Section 6.

## 2 The Background Knowledge Selection Problem

Ontology matching is the process of automatically discovering semantic correspondences between the entities of two ontologies that are assumed to cover overlapping domains of knowledge. The result of the ontology matching process is a set of pairs of cross-ontology entities (names of concepts or properties) called an *alignment*, where the entities of each pair are bound by a given semantic relation (most commonly equivalence) [6].

As pointed out in the introduction, using an appropriate background knowledge source (hereafter, *BK* for short) in the matching process can help improve the results by potentially decreasing the complexity of the process. A *BK* is understood as any piece of external information that can be used in order to improve the matching quality. According to [1], one can consider as *BK* for ontology matching a large range of external sources, such as linked data, domain specific corpora of schema and alignments, domain specific or general purpose ontologies, dictionaries and thesauri, lexical databases. Since, on the one hand, the choice of *BK* has a direct impact on the results and, on the other hand, – there is a multitude of available *BK* sources, researchers in the field have recognized the need for an approach to select automatically the optimal *BK* for a given matching task.

### 2.1 Criterium of Optimality of a *BK*

There is a large set of *BK* sources that can be considered, some of them not even known to the user. For that reason, it is important to frame formally the criterium that defines an optimal *BK*. Since the aim of using a *BK* is to provide good quality matching results no matter the provenance and nature of the *BK*, its choice has to be motivated by the maximization of the alignment quality. Suppose that for a given matching task (a pair of ontologies to be aligned) there exists a reference alignment, either provided by an expert or produced automatically. The best *BK* for this matching task, that we call *optimal BK*, is

selected as the one that produces the best alignment with respect to the reference in terms of F-measure.

Let  $\Gamma = \{BK_1, \dots, BK_n\}$  be a set of known *BK*s. Let  $s, t$  be two ontologies ( $s$  for *source* and  $t$  for *target*) and  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  – a set of alignments of  $s$  and  $t$  each using a different *BK* from  $\Gamma$ , given as  $A_i = (s, t, A_{ref}, F_i)$ , where  $A_i$  is produced by using  $BK_i$ ,  $A_{ref}$  is a reference alignment for  $s$  and  $t$  and  $F_i$  is the corresponding F-measure score of  $A_i$  with respect to  $A_{ref}$ ,  $\forall i = 1, \dots, n$ .

**Definition 1 (Optimal *BK*).** We define the **optimal** background knowledge source for the task of matching  $t$  and  $s$  as the background knowledge source  $BK_o \in \Gamma$ , which corresponds to an alignment from  $\mathcal{A}$  with maximal F-measure value. In case multiple *BK*s produce alignments with maximal F-measure values, the one with the lowest number of entities is defined as optimal.

The optimality criterium given above is inherently semantic, although this remains implicit in the definition. The *BK*-based ontology matching systems are designed in such manner that the *BK* that maximizes the F-measure value of an alignment of two ontologies is the one that is closest in content to these ontologies. This is the reason why our selection method is based on content similarity between the *BK* sources and the input ontologies. In our experiments, we show that a *BK* selected by the help of this method is optimal in the sense of definition 1 (see Section 4).

As a final remark, note that we do not base the selection criterium on the improvement provided by a *BK* as compared to a direct matching. Our assumption is that an user is looking for a *BK* because she is not satisfied with the results achieved by a direct matching, or in other words, we assume that the best *BK*-assisted alignment is better than the best direct one for the particular matching task.

## 2.2 Requirements to an Automatic *BK* Selection System

We outline the requirements that, in our view, a *BK* selection system has to meet.

1. ***BK* type independence.** The system has to be able to take into account *BK*s serialized differently (SKOS, OWL, ttl, *etc.*) and of different semantic nature (thesauri, ontologies, lexical databases, corpora).
2. **Domain independence.** The system should be able to propose a *BK* for a pair of ontologies of any given domain of knowledge.
3. **Multilingualism.** The system has to be able to select a *BK* that assists the alignment of cross-lingual ontologies.
4. **Automaticity.** The system has to be fully automatic.
5. **Optimality.** It should be guaranteed that the system returns an optimal *BK* with respect to a matching task in the sense of definition 1.

As we will see in what follows, the approach that we propose and the system that implements it conform to these five requirements.




Fig. 1: The *BK* indexing and selection process. The elements in dashed lines are not part of the selection workflow.

### 3 An Information Retrieval Approach to Automatic Selection of *BK*

We situate the *BK* selection problem in an information retrieval framework. We consider  $\Gamma$  as a corpus of documents and a given pair of ontologies  $s$  and  $t$  to be aligned – as a query document in the form of a set of terms. The corpus  $\Gamma$  is indexed in order to represent its content by using standard information retrieval techniques, that we explain further on. One of the particularities of our approach consists in the fact that we construct a common index for all known *BK*s, independent on their domain and focus. As we shall see, in this way we reply to the first two requirements given in the previous section. Additionally, the effort of indexing large ontologies is performed only once, which contributes to the efficiency of the approach. Note also, that the query is given in the form of a unique document representing the pair of ontologies (and not one document per ontology), because we want to retrieve the background knowledge that is common for the two and therefore allows for their reconciliation. In the following, we first explain on how we transform the *BK* sources and the query ontologies to documents. Then we describe the indexing process and present a set of similarity measures that we use in our approach for retrieving the optimal *BK* for a given matching task. The overall process is depicted in Figure 1.

#### 3.1 Modeling Ontologies and *BK*s as Structure-Content Documents

We map a *BK* source to a text document that we call a *BK*-document in a manner that allows for taking into account both the content and the structure

of the knowledge sources into account. The term extraction method consists in the following. Each token of the labels of the concepts of a given *BK* becomes a term in the corresponding *BK*-document. In order to preserve the information relevant to the *BK* structure, we add a given term to the *BK*-document every time when it appears in a label of a sub-class or a superclass within the *BK* hierarchy or, more generally speaking, when it appears in the label of a concept in the domain or the range of a property.

To illustrate this idea, take a part of a *BK* where the classes  $\{Author, Administrator, PhD\ Student, Professor\}$  are all in a `subclassOf` relation with the class *Person*. Without the use of the structure, the resulting *BK*-document would be  $d_{BK} = \{Person, Author, Administrator, PhDStudent, Professor\}$  with all the terms having the same weight with respect to their frequency of occurrence. However, the term *Person* seems to be more important than the other terms in the *BK* as it is a label of their common superclass. Not considering this semantic information affects considerably the computation of weights in the indexing phase. By using the structural information, the *BK*-document becomes  $d'_{BK} = \{Person, Person, Person, Person, Person, Author, Administrator, PhDStudent, Professor\}$ .

We model in this manner all known *BK*s in  $\Gamma$ , resulting in the corpus  $D_\Gamma = \{d_{BK_1}, d_{BK_2}, \dots, d_{BK_n}\}$ . We proceed in the same manner in order to represent a pair of ontologies,  $t$  and  $s$ , as a query document, denoted by  $q_{t,s}$  by creating a document for each ontology as shown above and then merging the two documents into a single one.

### 3.2 Indexation

Prior to indexing, we apply a standard set of text preprocessing methods, such as normalization of characters and spaces, removing diacritics or accents, deleting numbers, punctuations and stop words, tokenization and lemmatization.

We index the documents in  $D_\Gamma$  by using the well-known vector model. We build an indexation matrix  $M$ , which has *BK*-document vectors as rows and index term vectors as columns. Standardly, the index terms are the terms collected from the *BK*-documents without repetition after preprocessing. We denote the set of index terms by  $C_t$ . Each element  $w_{ij}$  of  $M$  corresponds to the weight of the term  $t_j$  with respect to  $d_{BK_i}$ .

In order to compute the weights  $w_{ij}$ , we use the well-known TF-IDF (Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency) weighting scheme that captures the importance of a term both within a single document and in a collection of documents. For a term  $t_j$  and a *BK*-document  $d_{BK_i}$ , the weight  $w_{ij}$  is calculated as follows:

$$w_{ij} = tf(t_j, d_{BK_i}) * \log\left(\frac{n}{df(t_j)}\right), \quad (1)$$

where  $tf(t_j, d_{BK_i})$  is the frequency of occurrence of the term  $t_j$  in the document  $d_{BK_i}$  and  $df(t_j)$  is the number of documents containing  $t_j$  and  $n$  is the number of documents in  $D_\Gamma$ .

### 3.3 Retrieving the Optimal *BK*

We need a similarity measure of some kind, which allows the system to return to the user the *BK* with highest similarity to the input ontologies query. In information retrieval, the most commonly applied similarity measure is the cosine similarity, denoted by *cosine*, given as the normalized dot product of two document vectors. We noticed that in certain cases parameter free measures of (rank) correlation can be applied more successfully than the cosine similarity measure for our particular problem. A measure of correlation expresses the degree of dependence of two random variables. It takes values between -1 and 1, assuming strong correlations for high positive values, strong anti-correlations for high negative values and no dependence for values close to 0. We introduce two of the most popular choices for correlation measures and show how they can serve as similarity measures for two documents [7]. Note that the correlation measures to be presented, just as the cosine measure, are based on the dot product of vectors. In that sense, the cosine similarity can be seen as a correlation, just as the correlations can be seen as similarity measures.

*Pearson Correlation.* The Pearson's coefficient  $r$  between two variables  $X$  and  $Y$  is calculated from their covariance  $cov_{X,Y}$  and their standard deviations  $\sigma_X$  and  $\sigma_Y$  in the following way:

$$r_{X,Y} = \frac{cov_{X,Y}}{\sigma_X * \sigma_Y} = \frac{\sum_i (x_i - m_X)(y_i - m_Y)}{\sqrt{\sum_i (x_i - m_X)^2} \sqrt{\sum_i (y_i - m_Y)^2}}, \quad (2)$$

where  $m_X$  and  $m_Y$  are the means of  $X$  and  $Y$ .

In our case, each of the variables  $X$  and  $Y$  corresponds to either a *BK*-document or a query document that all live in the same space and are therefore representable by the same type and number of features ( $i$  in (2) takes values from 1 to the number of index features). The sets of values  $\{x_i\}$  and  $\{y_i\}$  correspond to the values of the *tf \* idf* vectors in our vector model. Pearson is used to test the linear dependency of variables.

*Spearman Correlation.* Spearman's coefficient provides a measure of the correlation of two variables  $X$  and  $Y$  represented as lists of statistical rankings. In contrast to Pearson, it is applied when a general monotonic relationship is expected between the variables. Formally, it is given as

$$\rho_s = 1 - \frac{6 \sum_i d_i^2}{n^3 - n}, \quad (3)$$

where  $d_i$  is the difference between the rank of the  $i$ th observation of the variable  $X$  and the rank of  $i$ th observation of the variable  $Y$ ,  $d_i = rank(x_i) - rank(y_i)$ . We transform the *tf \* idf* values to ranks by using the partial order on real numbers. In case of equal values, we assign equal ranks.



*BK Selection.* For a given corpus of indexed *BK*-documents  $D_\Gamma$ , a query  $q_{s,t}$  and a similarity measure  $\sigma \in \{\text{cosine}, r, \rho_s\}$ , the selected *BK* is the one whose *BK*-document maximizes the similarity between the query and the documents in  $D_\Gamma$ , given as

$$D_{BK_{s,t}} = \arg \max_{D_{BK} \in D_\Gamma} \sigma(D_{BK}, q_{s,t}). \quad (4)$$

In case more than one *BK*s provide a maximal similarity to the query, the one with lowest number of entities is selected.

We show experimentally in Section 4 that the selected background knowledge source  $BK_{s,t}$  corresponding to the *BK*-document  $D_{BK_{s,t}}$  is optimal in the sense of definition 1.

## 4 Evaluation and Results

In order to evaluate our approach, we have conducted two types of experiments. In the first type, we use data coming from the ontology alignment evaluation initiative (OAEI)<sup>2</sup> of year 2015. Our aim is to test if our approach selects the optimal *BK* among a set of *BK* sources in two scenarios: selecting a domain specific *BK* or selecting a general purpose *BK*. We take a set of *BK*s  $\Gamma = \{\text{Yago}, \text{DBpedia}, \text{BabelNet}, \text{DBnary}, \text{FMA}, \text{Doid}, \text{Uberon}\}$ , described below. The set  $\Gamma$  includes general purpose sources (Yago, DBpedia, BabelNet and DBnary), as well as several domain specific anatomy and biomedical *BK*s (FMA, Doid, Uberon). In the second type of experiments, we use real world ontologies about musical instruments coming from the DOREMUS project<sup>3</sup> that have no reference alignment available.

As described in Section 3, the selected *BK* for each task has to conform to the optimality criterium given in Definition 1. In order to verify this criterium, we need a F-measure score produced as a result of the comparison of an alignment given by an ontology matching system that uses *BK* in its process and a reference alignment. For the totality of our experiments, we have used the system LYAM++[3], which is entirely based on *BK* and has also shown to perform well on the OAEI tracks on which it participated last year [8].

Note again that the aim of these experiments is not to show the quality of the ontology matching tools, but to evaluate the performance of the *BK*-selection approach proposed in this paper. The pairs of ontologies to be aligned, as well as the *BK*s in  $\Gamma$  are modeled as documents and indexed as described in the previous section. In the retrieval phase, we have tested the performance of the three similarity measures given in Section 3 - the commonly used cosine similarity and the two parameter-free correlation coefficients (Pearson and Spearman).

<sup>2</sup> <http://oaei.ontologymatching.org/>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.doremus.org/>

## 4.1 Experiments 1: OAEI Tracks

OAEI is an annual evaluation campaign that challenges the performance of ontology matching systems on a number of tracks, designed to test each a particular characteristic of the matching problem. We start by describing the four OAEI tracks that we consider in the experiments.

**The OAEI tracks.** The **Anatomy track** aims at discovering alignments between a human anatomy ontology, part of the NCI Thesaurus<sup>4</sup> and a mouse anatomy ontology. This track is considered as a large-scale matching task because the input ontologies are of a large size and very rich semantically. The **Large Biomedical track** aims at aligning three large bio-medical ontologies, namely FMA, SNOMED and the NCI Thesaurus. Since FMA appears in a query couple, we did not consider this ontology as background knowledge source for this track. The Anatomy and the Large biomedical tracks have been selected to make sure that at each experiment our approach selects from  $\Gamma$  the right  $BK$  for the right domain, respectively anatomy and biomedicine.

The **Conference track** contains a dataset of about 15 ontologies from the scientific publication field, together with reference alignments. We have used with the Conference dataset to test if the approach selects the optimal general purpose  $BK$  among the mixed set of  $BK$ s  $\Gamma$ . Note that, although the Conference data are specific to the scientific publishing domain, they can be considered as general purpose due to the type of concepts that are used to describe this domain, often dealing with common sense knowledge.

Finally, the **MultiFarm track** is derived from the Conference track data by translating the conference ontologies into several different languages with the aim to challenge the performance of cross-lingual ontology matching tools. In our scenario, this track is appropriate for testing whether the selection procedure is able of choosing an optimal multilingual knowledge source for aligning cross-lingual ontologies.

**BK sources.** We give a quick overview of the  $BK$  sources used in this evaluation. BabelNet [9] is a multi-lingual semantic network and an ontology that has been built by merging different encyclopedic and linguistic resources. The integration of these resources has been conducted automatically. BabelNet appears to be an appropriate choice of a  $BK$  for the *MultiFarm* track. DBnary<sup>5</sup> [10] is a multilingual lexical database extracted from Wiktionary, which is also a potentially good candidate for the MultiFarm track. DBpedia [11] is a large multilingual knowledge graph extracted from Wikipedia, covering a multitude of areas such as music, films, people, places, *etc.*. YAGO [12] (Yet Another Great Ontology) is a another large multilingual general purpose knowledge graph extracted from Wikipedia, GeoNames<sup>6</sup> and WordNet. Both YAGO and DBpedia

<sup>4</sup> <https://ncit.nci.nih.gov/ncitbrowser/>

<sup>5</sup> <http://kaiko.getalp.org/about-dbnary/>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.geonames.org/>

can be considered as candidates for a large variety of general purpose ontology matching tasks. Doid<sup>7</sup> is an open source ontology for the integration of biomedical data associated with human diseases. In our evaluation setting, Doid can be potentially used for aligning Biomedical or Anatomy-related ontologies. FMA (Foundational Model of Anatomy) [13] is the reference ontology for the anatomy field. Similarly, Uberon [14] is a multi-species anatomy ontology. Both ontologies can be used for the Anatomy ontology matching task.

Table 1: Anatomy and Large Biomedical Tasks

|          | Anatomy     |             |             |             | Large Biomedical |             |            |             |
|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
|          | Cosin       | Pearson     | Spearman    | F-m         | Cosin            | Pearson     | Spearman   | F-m         |
| BabelNet | 0.03        | 0.06        | -0.76       | 0.05        | 0.0              | 0.0         | -0.66      | 0.0         |
| DBnary   | 0.02        | 0.07        | -0.72       | 0.0         | 0.02             | 0.02        | -0.51      | 0.0         |
| DBpedia  | 0.01        | 0.01        | -0.70       | 0.0         | 0.05             | 0.06        | -0.60      | 0.0         |
| Doid     | 0.10        | 0.15        | -0.14       | 0.66        | 0.15             | <b>0.14</b> | 0.40       | 0.53        |
| Uberon   | 0.26        | <b>0.33</b> | <b>0.40</b> | <b>0.79</b> | <b>0.16</b>      | <b>0.14</b> | <b>0.5</b> | <b>0.60</b> |
| YaGo     | 0.01        | 0.01        | -0.20       | 0.0         | 0.03             | 0.03        | -0.22      | 0.0         |
| FMA      | <b>0.30</b> | <b>0.33</b> | 0.20        | 0.46        | -                | -           | -          | -           |

Table 2: Conference and MultiFarm Tasks

|          | Conference  |             |             |             | MultiFarm   |             |             |             |
|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|          | Cosine      | Pearson     | Spearman    | F-m         | Cosine      | Pearson     | Spearman    | F-m         |
| BabelNet | 0.28        | -0.08       | <b>0.73</b> | <b>0.61</b> | <b>0.30</b> | <b>0.39</b> | <b>0.44</b> | <b>0.49</b> |
| DBnary   | 0.06        | -0.01       | -0.34       | 0.46        | 0.16        | -0.20       | 0.22        | 0.29        |
| DBpedia  | 0.1         | -0.02       | 0.12        | 0.12        | 0.01        | 0.03        | 0.09        | 0.10        |
| Doid     | 0.10        | 0.01        | -0.05       | 0.0         | 0.0         | 0.0         | 0.0         | 0.0         |
| FMA      | 0.08        | -0.05       | -0.07       | 0.0         | 0.0         | 0.0         | 0.0         | 0.0         |
| Uberon   | 0.11        | 0.0         | 0.05        | 0.0         | 0.0         | 0.0         | 0.0         | 0.0         |
| YaGo     | <b>0.30</b> | <b>0.11</b> | 0.31        | 0.10        | 0.10        | 0.09        | -0.09       | 0.11        |

**Results Presentation.** The results from this series of experiments are presented in Tables 1 and 2. For each  $BK$ , we provide the average similarity scores obtained by each of the three similarity measures described in Section 3 and the corresponding average F-measure values obtained in the  $BK$ -based alignment. The average values are computed over all pairs of ontologies in each track. The best score achieved by each similarity measure, as well as the highest F-measure value are highlighted. The two correlation coefficients take values in the  $[-1, 1]$ , which explains the negative numbers. We are interested in strong correlations, corresponding to high similarity. Recall that according to our criterium, the  $BK$  selected by a similarity measure is optimal if it guarantees the highest F-measure.

<sup>7</sup> <http://do-wiki.nubic.northwestern.edu/do-wiki/index.php>

## 4.2 Experiment 2: Real-World Domain Ontologies

In the current experiment, we use data coming from the musical field and particularly related to the Doremus project. One of the aims of this project is to create a data model and multilingual controlled vocabularies, specifically designed for music [15]. We consider two domain specific SKOS vocabularies describing musical instruments: IAML<sup>8</sup> used and developed by the International Association of Music Libraries Archives and Documentation Centres and RAMEAU<sup>9</sup>, the musical instruments reference vocabulary of the French National Library (BnF). These ontologies contain about 700 hierarchically structured SKOS concepts each. We add to the set of *BK* candidates the MIMO<sup>10</sup> vocabulary, which is a large ontology of musical instruments, containing about 2500 classes. In this task, we test the capacity of our approach to select the *BK* that is most suitable for aligning vocabularies dealing with musical instruments. The results of this experiment are reported in Table 3 following the same presentation logic as in the previous subsection. The absence of a F-measure column is explained by the lack of reference alignment for the two musical instruments ontologies.

Table 3: Ontologies of musical instruments

|                 | <b>Cosine</b> | <b>Pearson</b> | <b>Spearman</b> |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| <b>BabelNet</b> | 0.09          | 0.0            | -0.30           |
| <b>DBnary</b>   | 0.01          | 0.0            | -0.39           |
| <b>DBpedia</b>  | 0.05          | 0.0            | -0.26           |
| <b>Doid</b>     | 0.0           | 0.0            | -0.41           |
| <b>FMA</b>      | 0.0           | 0.0            | -0.40           |
| <b>MIMO</b>     | <b>0.26</b>   | <b>0.30</b>    | <b>0.66</b>     |
| <b>Uberon</b>   | 0.0           | 0.0            | -0.40           |
| <b>YaGo</b>     | 0.08          | 0.03           | -0.22           |

## 4.3 Results Analysis

As it can be seen from the results in Tables 1 and 2, our approach systematically selects the optimal *BK*, independently on the track, by using the Spearman correlation and very conclusively so with similarity scores around and above 0.5. The performance of the selection method is flawed when using the cosine similarity, which is the common choice for a similarity measure in an information retrieval setting, but ranks only second best in our experiments. Namely, it fails to detect the optimal *BK* on the Anatomy and the Conference tracks and on the other tracks its outcome does not always help to come up with a clear cut decision.

<sup>8</sup> <https://github.com/DOREMUS-ANR/knowledge-base/blob/master/vocabularies/iaml.ttl>

<sup>9</sup> <https://github.com/DOREMUS-ANR/knowledge-base/blob/master/vocabularies/rameau.ttl>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.mimo-db.eu/>

We explain this observation by the fact that the Spearman measure is based on ranks instead of real values and on monotonic dependencies between the two vectors. Precisely, a small variation in the corresponding values of two vectors influences the cosine similarity negatively, while this is less so in case of Spearman. Spearman seems to be also better suited to dealing with highly sparse data (it is most of the times the case that the query document corresponding to two input ontologies contains much less terms than any of the *BK*-documents in the selection pool).

As for the Pearson correlation coefficient, Spearman appears to largely outperform that, as well. This is mainly due to the fact that the Pearson correlation measure is suited for testing linearity of the variables, while Spearman assumes monotonic behavior of the rank pairs. We draw the reader’s attention to the fact on the Anatomy track Pearson yields a maximal value for two different *BK*s – Uberon and FMA. The *BK* selected by this measure is Uberon, the smaller of the two sources, conforming to our selection condition given at the end of Section 3.

Regarding the real-world data experiment in the musical field, the results in Table 3 show that the *BK* that achieves the best score for all three similarity measures is MIMO, the only music-oriented *BK* in our collection. Note that although here the three similarity measures agree on the choice of a *BK*, it is again Spearman that achieves the highest value. In the absence of reference alignment between IAML and RAMEAU, we cannot verify the optimality of the selected *BK*, although our strong intuition is that it is optimal, because it is the only one dealing specifically with music.

Finally, we note that the choice of a similarity measure is more important in the presence of multiple similar in terms of domains *BK*s, as this is the case in the OAEI experiments, where the only similarity measure that remains unflawed is Spearman. In case the topical distance between the optimal *BK* and the other *BK*s in the corpus is large, as this is the case in the Doremus experiments, the choice of a similarity measure has little impact, since they all select the most suitable *BK* source for the given task.

## 5 Related Work

We provide an overview of related approaches to ontology matching with regard to two aspects of this task: (1) the use of background knowledge and (2) the automatic selection of background knowledge.

### 5.1 Ontology Matching Using Background Knowledge

The idea of using background knowledge (BK) for enhancing ontology matching task is not new and has been successfully adopted in several matching approaches. Although not directly relevant to our study, which focuses on the *BK* selection process, we summarize here the main groups of relevant approaches.

An intuitive idea is to rely on reusing existing mappings in order to improve the mappings produced by a system. Several approaches [16,17,18] follow this paradigm. The main drawback of this group of methods is the fact that they depend heavily on the quality of the re-used mappings and, hence, on the performance of the ontology matching techniques that have been used to produce them.

Another approach consists in using a corpus, which can be seen as a rich collection of data elements and their data types, relationships between elements, sample data instances and other information that can be used to discover mappings between entities [19,20]. Furthermore, domain specific ontologies are often seen as quality sources of background knowledge. In [21,22], the alignment process takes place in two steps: *anchoring* and *driving relations*. Anchoring consists in matching the concepts of the source and target ontologies to the concepts of the reference knowledge using standard ontology matching techniques. Relations between source and target concepts are derived by checking if their corresponding anchored concepts are related.

A group of approaches relies on the web in order to discover (by crawling) automatically relations between the input ontologies entities that may exist in various knowledge sources distributed on the web [4]. This is particularly useful when the needed background knowledge is spread among different sources. More recently, several approaches have been proposed that rely on general purpose knowledge graphs, such as Yago and DPBedia. It has been shown that such sources are particularly useful for aligning cross-lingual ontologies [5,3].

## 5.2 Automatic Selection of Background Knowledge

To the best of our knowledge, there are only a few approaches that have addressed the question of automatic *BK* selection.

In [23], an automatic background knowledge selection approach has been proposed for the particular task of matching biomedical ontologies based on the notion of mappings gain (MG). MG is used to estimate the individual usefulness of background knowledge sources and is defined as a function of the improvement of the number of correct mappings by using a given *BK* source as compared to a direct mapping of two ontologies. The *BK* providing the highest MG is selected. The authors have shown experimentally the correlation between the mapping gain and the F-measure in most of the matching tasks that they perform. However, it seems that the notion of MG is not always reliable. Indeed, as reported by the authors, despite having a relatively high mapping gain, using a selected *BK* may have a negative impact on the results for some tasks; this is the case of using WordNet as *BK*. The main drawback of the approach is the fact that the selection procedure, defined by the concept of MG, depends on an already existing alignment between the source ontologies.

The closest to our work is reported in [24]. In this approach, a local repository is built from a set of ontologies, to be used as background knowledge sources. These resources are indexed by extracting concept names, comments and labels. In addition and separately, structural features are taken into account. Querying

the repository is performed for a given source and target ontology, modeled as sets of key words. If a suitable BK is not found for the given ontologies in the repository, the method searches the web for appropriate *BK* ontologies. In the likely case of returning more than one ontology, all found ontologies are used for the matching independently and a unified result set is produced. As reported, the adopted strategy aims at selecting the BK that maximizes the F-measure score for a given matching task, although no experimental results are presented to illustrate and support this selection criterium.

*Positioning.* We present the major points, which differentiate our technique as compared to the two approaches described above.

Although also relying on information retrieval techniques, in our method, the query is represented as a single document, built in the same way as the *BK*-documents. This allows to avoid the complex weighted similarity computation in [24], depending on the setting of two parameters. Instead of creating two classes of features (one for terms and one for structure), we embed the structure of the *BKs* and of the input ontologies in their respective textual representations (see Section 3), which has the potential to produce a more compact index.

We make clear distinction between query ontologies and *BKs* in the evaluation phase. Indeed, the evaluation presented in [24] is highly biased by the fact that the authors use the same type of ontologies as queries and as *BK* (for example, if aligning two ontologies from the Benchmark track of OAEL, the authors would include the rest of the Benchmark ontologies as *BK* candidates), which will lead to having in the repository always a very useful *BK* source at hand. This is however, hardly a realistic scenario. In contrast, we use as *BKs* well-established and widely used knowledge graphs that are much likely to be called upon as *BK* sources for solving a real-life alignment problem. In that line of thought, our approach is generic and can handle different domains, contrarily to [23].

In both [24] and [23] the *BK* selection appears to be strongly coupled with the actual matching procedure. One of the main motivations of work is to dissociate completely the *BK* selection process from the alignment procedure.

In contrast to our work, the results presented in [24] are not reproducible, because no information is given regarding the selected *BKs*, neither about the similarity measure that has been used in the process. In turn, no direct experimental comparison to the approach is possible.

## 6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we have addressed the problem of automatic selection of background knowledge sources for the task of ontology matching. We propose an approach using information retrieval techniques implemented in an automatic domain independent system that can handle multilingual input ontologies. We build an index for a set of known, well-established in the semantic web field knowledge sources, that are often used as *BK* for aligning ontologies. For a

pair of ontologies to be matched, the selection process is a result of querying the indexed corpus for semantically similar *BK* sources from the indexed data. We provide an in-depth empirical study and we show that in certain cases the standard choice of a cosine similarity is not the most optimal and parameter free correlation measures can help discriminate better between close in terms of domains *BK* sources. We define an optimality criterium of selection based on the quality of the matching and we show experimentally that our approach satisfies this criterium. Contrarily to state of the art approaches, our technique has the advantage of not being based on a preliminary direct matching between the input ontologies.

In the future, we plan to work on optimizing the selection process by improving the quality of the index features. In that respect, we will consider the task of *BK* preselection for a particular domain, to be applied prior to the selection algorithm. We also plan to improve our selection criterium in order to take into account the trade-off between optimality and efficiency. Finally, we will investigate the benefits of the development of a *BK* selection method to assist the instance matching and link discovery processes.

## References

1. P. Shvaiko and J. Euzenat, "Ontology matching: state of the art and future challenges," *Knowledge and Data Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 158–176, 2013.
2. D. Faria, C. Pesquita, E. Santos, M. Palmonari, I. F. Cruz, and F. M. Couto, "The agreementmakerlight ontology matching system," in *ODBASE*, pp. 527–541, 2013.
3. A. N. Tigrine, Z. Bellahsene, and K. Todorov, "Light-weight cross-lingual ontology matching with LYAM++," in *ODBASE*, pp. 527–544, 2015.
4. M. Sabou, M. d'Aquin, and E. Motta, "Exploring the semantic web as background knowledge for ontology matching," *J. Data Semantics*, vol. 11, pp. 156–190, 2008.
5. K. Todorov, C. Hudelot, and P. Geibel, "Fuzzy and cross-lingual ontology matching mediated by background knowledge," in *Uncertainty Reasoning for the Semantic Web III*, pp. 142–162, Springer, 2014.
6. D. Ngo, Z. Bellahsene, and K. Todorov, "Opening the black box of ontology matching," in *The Semantic Web: Semantics and Big Data*, pp. 16–30, Springer, 2013.
7. W. J. Conover, *Practical Nonparametric Statistics*. Wiley, 1998.
8. A. N. Tigrine, Z. Bellahsene, and K. Todorov, "Lyam++ results for oaei 2015," *OM at ISWC*, 2015.
9. R. Navigli and S. P. Ponzetto, "Babelnet: The automatic construction, evaluation and application of a wide-coverage multilingual semantic network," *Artif. Intell.*, vol. 193, pp. 217–250, 2012.
10. G. Sérasset, "Dbnary: Wiktionary as a lemon-based multilingual lexical resource in RDF," *Semantic Web*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 355–361, 2015.
11. S. Auer, C. Bizer, G. Kobilarov, J. Lehmann, R. Cyganiak, and Z. G. Ives, "Dbpedia: A nucleus for a web of open data," in *ISWC 2007 + ASWC*, pp. 722–735, 2007.
12. F. M. Suchanek, G. Kasneci, and G. Weikum, "Yago: a core of semantic knowledge," in *WWW*, pp. 697–706, 2007.



13. C. Rosse and J. Mejino, "A reference ontology for biomedical informatics: the foundational model of anatomy," *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 478–500, 2003.
14. M. Haendel, J. P. Balhoff, F. B. Bastian, D. C. Blackburn, J. A. Blake, Y. Bradford, A. Comte, W. M. Dahdul, T. Dececchi, R. E. Druzinsky, T. F. Hayamizu, N. Ibrahim, S. E. Lewis, P. M. Mabee, A. Niknejad, M. Robinson-Rechavi, P. C. Sereno, and C. J. Mungall, "Unification of multi-species vertebrate anatomy ontologies for comparative biology in uberon," *J. Biomedical Semantics*, vol. 5, p. 21, 2014.
15. M. Achichi, R. Bailly, C. Cecconi, M. Destandau, K. Todorov, and R. Troncy, "DOREMUS: doing reusable musical data," in *Proceedings of the ISWC 2015 Posters & Demonstrations Track*, 2015.
16. H. H. Do and E. Rahm, "COMA - A system for flexible combination of schema matching approaches," in *VLDB*, pp. 610–621, 2002.
17. A. Groß, M. Hartung, T. Kirsten, and E. Rahm, "GOMMA results for OAEI 2012," in *Workshop on Ontology Matching*, 2012.
18. B. Saha, I. Stanoi, and K. L. Clarkson, "Schema covering: a step towards enabling reuse in information integration," in *ICDE*, pp. 285–296, 2010.
19. J. Madhavan, P. A. Bernstein, K. Chen, A. Y. Halevy, and P. Shenyoy, "Corpus-based schema matching," in *Proceedings of IJCAI-03 Workshop on Information Integration on the Web (IIWeb-03)*, pp. 59–63, 2003.
20. J. Madhavan, P. A. Bernstein, A. Doan, and A. Y. Halevy, "Corpus-based schema matching," in *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE*, pp. 57–68, 2005.
21. Z. Aleksovski, M. C. A. Klein, W. ten Kate, and F. van Harmelen, "Matching unstructured vocabularies using a background ontology," in *EKAW*, pp. 182–197, 2006.
22. Z. Aleksovski, W. ten Kate, and F. van Harmelen, "Exploiting the structure of background knowledge used in ontology matching," in *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Ontology Matching (OM-2006), (ISWC-2006)*, 2006.
23. D. Faria, C. Pesquita, E. Santos, I. Cruz, and F. Couto, "Automatic background knowledge selection for matching biomedical ontologies.," in *PLoS ONE 9(11): e111226. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0111226*, 2014.
24. C. Quix, P. Roy, and D. Kensché, "Automatic selection of background knowledge for ontology matching," in *SWIM*, p. 5, 2011.